

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA  
FLORENCE DIVISION**

Travis Bellamy, #323612,	)	Civil Action No. 4:17-445-RMG
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	
v.	)	<b>ORDER AND OPINION</b>
	)	
Parties listed in case 8:16-cv-3320, <i>et al.</i> ,	)	
	)	
Defendants.	)	
<hr style="width:40%; margin-left:0"/>	)	

This matter is before the Court on the Report and Recommendation of the Magistrate Judge, recommending summary dismissal of the complaint. For the reasons set forth below, the Court adopts the Report and Recommendation.

Plaintiff filed a Form AO241, a petition for § 2254 habeas relief, but scratched out the title and typed “Writ of Error” and “§ 1983” in place of “habeas.” Plaintiff appears to be attempting to appeal the results of other federal cases:

The issues being argued in this case are essentially the same issues being argued in the MuQuit case 8:14-cv-3555-RBH-JDA, also those issues and claims being argued in cases 4:16-cv-2939, 3101-310-MBS-TER which were blocked by Judge Seymour, who was required to recuse herself, creating a structural error that void her jurisdiction for Due Process violation. This applies to Judge Cain in case 0:16-cv-992. The issues argued in those related cases are now argued within this case as well, to include those claims, § 1983 actions and Writs of Errors presented in their totality. I am one of the 300+ inmates who attempted to get the legal issues of controversy heard in my case only to be subjected to egregious acts of machination and fraud upon the court behind religious, political and social claims argued in this case and its connection to the Crawford case. Lawrence L. Crawford is a Foreign Sovereign King, Kalifah, Imam and High Priest to The (4) Global Thrones Of The Reestablished Global Theocratic State.

(Dkt. No. 1 at 3–4.) Plaintiff proceeds for 37 single-spaced, typed pages, complaining that state prosecutors mentioned the religious beliefs of the “King-Khalifah,” apparently meaning Lawrence Crawford, during the state-court murder trial of the “King-Khalifah.” For relief, Plaintiff seeks


vacatur of his conviction, transfer to a prerelease camp, consolidation of this case with others, transfer of this action and other cases before this Court to New Jersey, and removal of his name and DNA “from all derogatory files.”

The complaint extensively references and is essentially identical to the several thousand pages of frivolous filings in *Muquit v. McFadden*, 8:14-3555-RBH-JDA (D.S.C.), *Sutcliffe v. Cain*, 4:16-2939-MBS-TER (D.S.C.), *Cook v. Cain*, 4:16-3101-MBS-TER (D.S.C.), *Sutcliffe v. S.C. Supreme Court*, 0:16-922-TMC-PJG (D.S.C.), *Bellamy v. Warden, Lieber CI*, 4:16-cv-3807-RMG-TER (D.S.C.), *Muquit v. The Judges Who Issue Order in Case 16-1953*, 8:16-3194-RBH-JDA (D.S.C.), *Cook v. The Judges Who Issue Order in Case 16-1953*, 8:16-3327-RBH-JDA (D.S.C.), *Crawford v. The Judges Who Issue Order in Case 16-1953*, 8:16-3328-RBH-TER (D.S.C.), *Cook v. McFadden*, 1:16-3853-RMG-SVH (D.S.C.), and *In re Lawrence Crawford*, 17-1415 (4th Cir.), as well as many cases in South Carolina state courts. An unidentified inmate is filing thousands of pages of frivolous filings in many cases including the instant case. The present complaint is an effort by that unidentified litigant to pursue claims rejected or pending in other actions, rather than a proper complaint alleging violations of the Constitution under color of state law injuring Mr. Bellamy (or a petition challenging Mr. Bellamy’s conviction or sentence under 28 U.S.C. § 2254, had he not crossed-out “2254” and wrote in “writ of error” and “1983” on his Form AO241).

The Magistrate Judge recommended summary dismissal of the complaint on March 29, 2017. Plaintiff has filed no objections to the Report and Recommendation. For the foregoing reasons and for the reasons the Magistrate Judge ably sets forth in the Report and Recommendation, the Court finds that the complaint is frivolous, that it fails to state a claim, and that it is therefore subject to summary dismissal under the Prison Litigation Reform Act, Pub. L.

No. 104-134, 110 Stat. 1321-71 (1996). The Court therefore **ADOPTS** the Report and Recommendation of the Magistrate Judge as the Order of the Court, and **DISMISSES** the complaint with prejudice and without service of process. This action is designated a “strike” pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(g).

**AND IT IS SO ORDERED.**



---

Richard Mark Gergel  
United States District Court Judge

April 27, 2017  
Charleston, South Carolina